

REMARKS


In the above-identified Office Action the claims were rejected for "double patenting" based on the related issued Haba patent when combined with the disclosure of the cited Courtney patent. In this regard, however, each of independent Claims 1, 3, and 10 have been amended in a manner which is believed to render those claims to be patentably distinct over the references. In particular, it is believed that the prior art does not disclose controlling the scanning speed of the motor of the image reading apparatus based on whether or not use is made of the virtual memory in the information processing apparatus which is connected to the image reading apparatus. Again, this concept is now clearly set forth in each of independent Claims 1, 3, and 10.

In the Office Action it was also required that Figs. 1 and 2 be identified as PRIOR ART. However, while those drawing figures are used in referring to the general background of the invention, Figs. 1 and 2 are specifically identified as disclosing a first embodiment of the invention. For example, see Page 8, lines 8-13, and Page 9, lines 11-13.

For these various reasons it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims are allowable as now presented and the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

John A. Krause

Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200